



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/719,389	06/25/2001	David Holliday	2365-105	8225

6449 7590 08/27/2007
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

HOSSAIN, FARZANA E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

08/27/2007

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/719,389

Applicant(s)

HOLLIDAY ET AL.

Examiner

Farzana E. Hossain

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 22-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 22-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/11/2007 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. This office action is in response to communications filed 06/11/2007. Claims 1, 14 and 16 are amended. Claims 2, 15 and 17 are original. Claims 3-13, 18 and 22-37 have been previously presented. Claims 19-21 are cancelled. Claims 38 and 39 are new.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 22-25, 38 and 39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. Applicant's arguments filed 06/11/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Claim 9, the applicant argues that Eyer disclose a hardware that is use to initially filter by IPG region and firmware as a second level filter to delete IPG data not available to IRD (Column 10, lines 52-56). Applicant further argues that Eyer fails to disclose assigning a channel set identity and a channel subset identity to each channel and filtering the channels by comparing set and subset identities to reference set and subset identities.

In response to the argument, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The argument of Eyer performing filtering by hardware or software is moot as Eyer meets the claim limitations. There is no claim limitation about the filtering and Eyer does not teach away from the applicant's invention. Eyer discloses that there is a channel set and subset identities via the source IDs including national and regional IDS which are applied to the channel CNN and a reference channel set and subset identities such as a "1" or "0" for preferred source and outputting display based on the comparison or a means for comparing the identities and means for outputting the signal (Column 7, lines 30-45, Column 8, lines 7-10). Eyer discloses the limitations of the claim. See rejection.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2623

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-18 and 37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding Claim 16, applicant argues that Eyer fails to teach or suggest broadcast schedule data at a faster rate than a second network broadcast program schedule data, a cache for storing different data, means for decoding cache data and means for receiving additional data.

In response to the applicant, Eyer discloses that the interactive program guide (IPG) is being broadcast over the satellite network, means for receiving and decoding additional program schedule data from the first network for either the first or second broadcast network (Column 13, lines 58-67, Column 5, lines 62-67, Column 8, lines 25-28, Column 15, lines 32-37). See new rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 16-18 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 16 discloses means for receiving and decoding additional program schedule data from the first network for either of the first or second broadcast network in response to user request. The first network has information transmitted at a faster rate than second.

The originally filed claim (filed 06/25/01 and claim 17 of the foreign application) discloses one network is faster than the other network (not defining which one) and receiving and decoding additional program schedule data for the network that is faster for the first or second network. Claims 17, 18 and 37 depend from claim 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 9-11, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eyer et al (US 6,160,545 and hereafter referred to as "Eyer").

Regarding Claim 9, Eyer discloses a receiver for receiving TV signals in a plurality of channels each defining a television program and/or services provided by a broadcaster (Column 5, lines 54-61, Column 6, lines 26-32), and a channel set identity

or national indicator and a channel subset identity or region ID (Column 7, lines 30-40, Column 8, lines 7-10), the receiver comprising

means for storing a reference channel set identity and one or more reference channel subset identities or preferred source data such as satellite or cable for CNN (Column 7, lines 30-45, Figure 1, 185, Column 8, lines 9-11, Column 9, lines 20-35);

Means for comparing the channel identity and channel subset identify or a channel in a received signal with the reference channel and channel subset identities as CNN has at least two sources from the satellite network and from the cable network and the receiver compares the identity of the network to a "1" or "0" (Column 7, lines 30-45); and

means for outputting the received TV signal for display of the program or other services defined depending on the comparison or after the comparison to determine the preferred sources selecting the channel from the preferred source for display (Column 7, lines 30-45).

Regarding Claim 10, Eyer discloses all the limitations of Claim 9. Eyer discloses storing means or RAM to store the common channel subset or national/global identifying programs and/or services receivable independent of the receivers location (Column 9, lines 43-52, Column 8, lines 7-10, Column 7, lines 30-40) and a regional channel subset identifying programs and/or other services receivable depending on the location of the receiver specific to a CATV network such as in a metropolitan area (Column 8, lines 7-10, 53-60, 164-67, Column 7, lines 30-40).

Regarding Claims 11 and 26, Eyer discloses all the limitations of Claims 9 and 10 respectively. Eyer discloses that each channel has associated with it a logical channel number which varies on a channel subset basis or satellite channels and cable channels depend on common data or global data (Column 9, lines 37-44) and region specific channel subset such as different CATV networks in a region (Column 9, lines 37-44), the receiver comprising means for displaying a list of program and/or other services containing the logical channel number or services and programming for specific channels (Column 9, lines 37-44).

11. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yuen al (US 6,028,599 and hereafter referred to as "Yuen").

Regarding Claim 14, Yuen discloses a receiver for receiving television signals in a plurality of channels each defining a television program, wherein the signals include sorting data defining a sorted list (Figure 1, Figure 4, Figure 5, Figure 13, 10), the receiver comprising:

means for filtering the scheduling data depending on the sorting data to produce output signals defining an image of selected events in the program schedule for display as a filtered schedule on a television screen in an order depending on the sorted list or pre-established time list and an extended theme show list (Figure 1, Figure 4, Figure 5, Column 1, lines 52-59, Column 11, lines 24-25, 48-60 Column 12, lines 32-34).

Regarding Claim 15, Yuen discloses all the limitations of Claim 14. Yuen discloses the sorting data includes data to enable events in the schedule defined by the

Art Unit: 2623

schedule data to be selected for display in the filtered schedule depending on the one of genre or subgenre (Column 12, lines 32-34, Column 10, lines 16-23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 22, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al (US 5,548,338 and hereafter referred to as "Ellis") in view of Keith et al (US 5,991,451 and hereafter referred to as "Keith").

Regarding Claim 1, Ellis discloses a receiver for receiving television signal in a plurality of channels each defining a television (TV) program, wherein at least a signal in one of the channels includes compressed program schedule data defining broadcast events in the channels, and for producing output signals defining an image of the broadcast events in the program schedule for displaying on a TV screen (Column 3, lines 26-35), the receiver comprising:

Data defining a dictionary or Huffman coding constructing a look up table and binary tree representing text portions (Column 8, lines 47-60);

Means for expanding the program schedule data by identifying corresponding text portions in the dictionary (Column 8, lines 47-60, Column 9, lines 16-31);

Means for constructing the image of events using identified corresponding text portions (Column 8, lines 47-60, Column 9, lines 16-31).

Ellis discloses receiving software updates (Column 3, lines 26-35), using the Huffman coding that constructs the lookup table and binary tree for stored corresponding text portion (Column 9, lines 16-31), and storing an application program (Column 9, lines 16-39). Ellis does not explicitly disclose means for receiving data defining two versions of a dictionary, means for determining which version of the dictionary the corresponding data is stored, means for storing the most recently accessed version of the dictionary. In analogous art, Keith discloses compression using Huffman coding or tables, means for receiving data defining two version of a dictionary (Column 7, lines 37-45, Column 8, lines 20-25), means for determining which version of dictionary for corresponding data is stored or Huffman table with corresponding data are stored (Column 7, lines 37-45, Column 8, lines 20-25), and means for storing the most recently accessed version of the dictionary using a table number (Column 7, lines 37-45, Column 8, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ellis to include means for receiving data defining two version of a dictionary (Column 7, lines 37-45, Column 8, lines 20-25), means for determining which version of dictionary for corresponding data is stored or Huffman table with corresponding data are stored (Column 7, lines 37-45, Column 8, lines 20-25), and means for storing the most recently accessed version of the dictionary using a table number (Column 7, lines 37-45, Column 8, lines 20-25) as taught by Keith in order to allow the encoder to swap code and allow the decoder to accurately decode the

Art Unit: 2623

encoded data and to update the tables for efficiency (Column 6, lines 62-66, Column 7, lines 37-45) as disclosed by Keith.

Regarding Claim 2, Ellis and Keith disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Ellis discloses that the text portions comprise an extended service description including PPV Channel Info (Column 3, lines 25-35, Column 9, Column 10, Table 4).

Regarding Claims 3 and 22, Ellis and Keith disclose all the limitations of Claims 1 and 2 respectively. Ellis discloses text portions comprise an event name (Column 9, Table 4).

Regarding Claim 5, Ellis and Keith disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Ellis discloses that text portions comprise extended event description (Column 3, lines 59-64, Column 9, Table 4).

Regarding Claim 6, Ellis and Keith disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Ellis discloses the text portions include a special event message (Column 10, Table 4).

Regarding Claim 7, Ellis and Keith disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Keith discloses means for receiving data of the other version of the dictionary and means for replacing the data of the one version of the dictionary in the storing means with data of the other version of the dictionary when the data for the text portion is determined to be stored in the other version of the dictionary (Column 7, lines 37-40).

Regarding Claim 8, Ellis and Keith disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Ellis discloses storing a default dictionary (Figure 2, 50, Column 3, lines 51-54). Keith discloses storing a default dictionary (Column y, lines 35-45, Column 8, lines 44-64, Figure 2, 214, Column 3, lines 35-44, Column 2, lines 1-16).

Regarding Claim 38, Ellis and Keith disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Keith discloses that the most recently accessed version of the dictionary or encoded bitstream is stored in a volatile memory or memory device or dynamic random access memory device (DRAM) (Figure 2, 214, Column 4, lines 30-32).

Regarding Claim 39, Ellis and Keith disclose all the limitations of Claim 38. Keith discloses a further dictionary that is stored in non-volatile memory or hard disk (Column 3, lines 38-40, Column 4, lines 38-40). Ellis discloses a dictionary is stored in non-volatile memory or hard disk (Column 9, lines 36-39).

14. Claims 4, 23, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of Keith as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Terasawa et al (US 6,147,714 and hereafter referred to as "Terasawa").

Regarding Claims 4, 23, 24 and 25, Ellis and Keith disclose all the limitations of Claims 1, 2, 3 and 22 respectively. Ellis discloses text portions comprise long titles (Column 9, Table 4). Ellis and Keith do not explicitly disclose a short event name. In analogous art, Terasawa disclose the text portions comprise a short event name (Column 7, lines 55-67, Column 8, line 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination to include the text portions comprise a short event name (Column 7, lines 55-67, Column 8, line 1) as taught by Terasawa in order to provide a succinct title to the user for easy selection as is well known in the art.

Art Unit: 2623

15. Claims 12, 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyer in view of Klosterman (US 6,072,983).

Regarding Claims 12, 27, 28, 29, Eyer discloses all limitations of Claims 9, 10, 11 and 26 respectively. Eyer discloses a program guide or IPG that displays a list of programs and services (Column 5, lines 54-61). Eyer is silent on an order channel number, which varies on channel subset basis, the receiver comprising means for displaying a list of programs and/or other services depending on the order channel number. Klosterman discloses receiving program schedule information, which is sorted in a predetermined order such that the program schedule is mixed, sorted, organized in a format (Column 6, lines 11-27). It is necessarily included that if there is a specific predetermined order in which the programming and services should be displayed that a number is associated with the order of the display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eyer to include an order number for receiving program schedule information which is sorted in a predetermined order such that the program schedule is mixed, sorted, organized in a format (Column 6, lines 11-27) as taught by Klosterman so that the program schedule is ready for immediate display and saves time (Column 6, lines 11-27) as disclosed by Klosterman.

16. Claims 13, 30, 31, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyer in view of Coleman et al (US 5,844,620 and hereafter referred to as "Coleman").

Regarding Claims 13, 30, 31, 33, Eyer discloses all limitations of Claims 9, 10, 11 and 26 respectively. Eyer is silent on each channel has associated with it one or more indicators, the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicators for controlling display of program and/or service information. Coleman discloses that each channel has associated with it one or more indicators such as closed captions (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27) theme categories (Column 4, lines 1-4) and rating/parental rating (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54), the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicator for controlling display of program as parental controls on the program (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54) or to display closed captioning (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eyer to include that each channel has associated with it one or more indicators such as closed captions (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27) theme categories (Column 4, lines 1-4) and rating/parental rating (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54), the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicator for controlling display of program as parental controls on the program (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54) or to display closed captioning (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27) as taught by Coleman in order to allow a user to obtain information relating to the provision of services over a network (Column 1, lines 10-15) as disclosed by Coleman.

Art Unit: 2623

17. Claims 16-18, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usui et al (US 5,808,694 and hereafter referred to as "Usui") in view of Yuen (WO 97/47136 and hereafter referred to as "Yuen2") and Eyer.

Regarding Claim 16, Usui discloses a receiver for receiving TV signals in a first plurality of channels broadcast in a first broadcast network and including program schedule data for the first network and TV signals in a second plurality of channels broadcast in a second broadcast network and including program schedule data for the second network (Figure 1, Column 6, lines 56-59, Column 7, lines 4-14, Figure 5, Column 8, lines 20-30, Figure 7, Column 9, lines 1-67, Column 10, lines 1-17, 22-26, Figure 22, 23, 24), a cache store for storing a portion of the program schedule data for the first and/or second network transmitted from the time to time in at least one of the channels broadcast in the first network and/or the second network (Figure 5, 225, Figure 7, Column 9, lines 1-67, Column 10, lines 1-17, 22-26), means for decoding or converting the data in the cache store for display of a program schedule of the first or second broadcast network (Figure 10, Column 12, lines 21-54, Figure 7, Column 9, lines 1-67, Column 10, lines 1-17, 22-26). The Microsoft Press 3rd edition Computer Dictionary defines decoder as a device or program routine that converts coded data back to its original form and this means changing unreadable or encrypted codes into readable text or changing one code to another.

Usui is silent on the program schedule data being broadcast in one network at a faster rate than in the other network and means for receiving and decoding additional

Art Unit: 2623

program schedule data from the first network for either the first or second broadcast network.

Yuen2 discloses that a user can receive program schedule data over a satellite network or cable network (Figure 1, 20, 36, Page 1, lines 28-33, Page 2, lines 13-15) and the program schedule data broadcast over the first network at a faster rate than in the second network (Figure 1, 20, 36, Page 1, lines 28-33, Page 2, lines 13-15). Eyer discloses that TV signals are broadcast via the first network or satellite network with program schedule or guide data (Figure 1, Column 3, lines 58-65) and TV signals are transmitted via second network or terrestrial/cable networks (Column 3, lines 58-65). Eyer discloses that the interactive program guide (IPG) is being broadcast over the satellite network, means for receiving and decoding additional program schedule data from the first network for either the first or second broadcast network (Column 13, lines 58-67, Column 5, lines 62-67, Column 8, lines 25-28, Column 15, lines 32-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Usui to include the program schedule data broadcast over the first network at a faster rate than in the second network (Figure 1, 20, 36, Page 1, lines 28-33, Page 2, lines 13-15) as taught by Yuen2 in order to send high speed data for the 150 or more channels to the user without a longer wait which is inconvenient to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify means for receiving and decoding additional program schedule data from the signals for the network (Column 13, lines 58-67, Column 5, lines 62-67, Column 8, lines 25-28, Column 15, lines 32-37)

Art Unit: 2623

as taught by Eyer in order to provide cost and bandwidth benefits for the receiver and memory management (Column 2, lines 62-67, Column 9, lines 62-67, Column 10, lines 1-6, Column 11, lines 8-18) as disclosed by Eyer.

Regarding Claim 17, Usui, Yuen2 and Eyer disclose all the limitations of Claim 16. Eyer discloses the cache store is updated when new data is transmitted in the first broadcast network or when the amount of time of IPG data can be stored such as the current 24 hours, which inherently includes that the cache store is updated with new data (Column 9, lines 21-24, 37-44, Column 10, lines 4-6).

Regarding Claims 18 and 37, Usui, Yuen2 and Eyer disclose all the limitations of Claims 16 and 17 respectively. Eyer discloses the broadcast program schedule data comprises depth data for specific models of receiver via the preformatted blocks of IPG data for daily schedules and title records (Column 11, lines 8-18), the receiver being arranged to receive depth data or receiving messages pertaining to and the amount of data that should be stored specifically schedule and title and/or descriptions in the cache store or RAM and this is dependent on the depth data or message to store as there are receivers without large enough storages to hold descriptions (Column 11, lines 26-33). The messages sent from the transmitted side is so that sorting and processing is performed only once at the transmitter versus at every decoder and also so that memory management is simplified (Column 9, lines 62-67, Column 10, lines 1-6, Column 11, lines 8-18).

Art Unit: 2623

18. Claim 32, 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eyer in view of Klosterman as applied to claims 12, 27-29 above, and further in view of Coleman.

Regarding Claims 32, 34, 35, 36, Eyer and Klosterman disclose all limitations of Claims 12, 27, 28, and 29 respectively. Eyer and Klosterman are silent on each channel has associated with it one or more indicators, the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicators for controlling display of program and/or service information. Coleman discloses that each channel has associated with it one or more indicators such as closed captions (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27) theme categories (Column 4, lines 1-4) and rating/parental rating (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54), the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicator for controlling display of program as parental controls on the program (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54) or to display closed captioning (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eyer in view of Klosterman to include that each channel has associated with it one or more indicators such as closed captions (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines 8-27) theme categories (Column 4, lines 1-4) and rating/parental rating (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54), the receiver comprising means responsive to the indicator for controlling display of program as parental controls on the program (Column 3, lines, 63-67, Column 4, lines 5-12, Column 22, lines 51-54) or to display closed captioning (Column 3, lines 54-60, Column 19, lines

8-27) as taught by Coleman in order to allow a user to obtain information relating to the provision of services over a network (Column 1, lines 10-15) as disclosed by Coleman.


Conclusion

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farzana E. Hossain whose telephone number is 571-272-5943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 am to 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FEH
August 17, 2007


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600